

E N D O R S E M E N T

W. MICHAEL CAHILL v. VERIZON, SYSTEM COUNCIL T6, LOCAL 2222 IBEW
04-CV-11986-MEL

LASKER, D.J.

Verizon moves for a more definite statement of W. Michael Cahill's ("Cahill") Complaint. Verizon contends that the Complaint lacks sufficient information to put Verizon on notice of the claims against it and fails to identify the transaction or occurrence from which Cahill's grievance stems in a manner that would allow Verizon to make an informed responsive pleading. The motion is GRANTED.

The Complaint, as written, fails to state a claim under federal law, to specifically allege that Cahill was wrongfully terminated and not rehired, or to allege that LOCAL 2222 IBEW failed to fulfill its duty of fair representation.

On its face, the Complaint must show a basis for federal jurisdiction. Therefore, Cahill is ordered to file a more definite statement that specifies under what particular federal law each claim is brought, so that the Court can determine whether federal jurisdiction is appropriate. Unless such a statement is filed within 30 days, the Complaint will be dismissed.

Accordingly, the defendants' motion for a more definite statement is GRANTED.

It is so ordered.

Dated: November 3, 2004
Boston, Massachusetts

/s/ Morris E. Lasker

U.S.D.J.